GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 280 N. OLD WOODWARD AVENUE, STE. 400, BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN 48009-5394 (248) 647-6000

modification to the aforementioned system disclosed by Lenz as evidenced by Parulski et al." Leaving aside the content of Parulski et al., any combination that suggests that the control of the configuration process be relegated to the user (client) location directly **opposes** the teachings and purpose of Lenz. Note the following:

> "The invention provides an automatic client configuration system. The invention utilizes an efficient, easily managed and operated centralized configuration file system that allows the user to configure an entire network of clients from a centralized server." (Lenz, Col. 1, lines 51-62)

The automatic client configuration system provides the system administrator with the ability to configure every client in a network with one file. The file resides on the server and contains information for setting the client's lock files, e.g. preferences, configuration information, and software versions. Control over logical groupings of clients is possible using separate configuration files for each group:

[In this context, as elsewhere in the disclosure, the word "user" refers to the user of the system disclosed – i.e., the System Administrator.]

> "The centralized ability to maintain and query clients in a network eases the burden on the administrator of manually updating the software and other information on each client's machine." (Col. 4, line 66 – Col. 5, line 2)

In addition, all of the examples in Lenz specify the use of a server computer acting as the source of the configuration files. The use of a server is an obvious requirement of "server-client" architecture.

An important aspect of Lenz is the need to limit the participation of clients to authorized members. Otherwise, any computer could connect to the network and download updates to commercial software that, while licensed to the authorized members, could not legally be made available to other clients in general. Thus, there is no motivation whatsoever to convert the system of Lenz to a system in which the control has be removed from the centralized management environment.

With respect to Parulski et al., while they disclose the use of removable memory, it is within a narrow context (Col. 3, ll. 12-20): "...the limited ability of an internal memory in an optical compact disc player to store user-generated image parameter data is augmented by providing a storage medium, such as an electrically programmable read only memory module, that is configured

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C. 280 N. OLD WOODWARD AVENUE, STE. 400, BIRMINGHAM, MICHIGAN 48009-5394 (248) 647-6000

to be removably interfaced with a CD player's microcontroller for storing image parameter data that has been (remotely) programmed by the user." In this case, the data provided in a **second** removable storage device holds "image parameter data" that is linked to a separate **first** storage device that holds the image file itself. The need for the **second** removable storage device is acknowledged by Parulski et al. (Col. 8, lines 15-21): "Because the system of Figure 1 uses a write-once optical disc, and because CD player 20 cannot record information onto the optical disc, it is not possible to store this data onto the compact disc 40 of Figure 2. Thus, some other method of storing the data is required. While a control data memory could be permanently housed within the CD player, it is preferable that the storage device, such as EEPROM module 60 in Figure 2, be removable and insertable into one or more other playback units."

In addition, Parulski et al. indicate:

> "In accordance with the present invention, such an auxiliary, transportable, memory module is used for storing user-sourced image customizing parameters, such as contrast, image magnification, color balance, saturation, border type and border location, etc., thereby enabling the user to save, in a removable memory module, parameters that have been input to the microcontroller, as by way of a conventional, hand-held remote control (IR) unit 200. Removable memory module 60 may then be extracted from interface 58 in the playback device and reinserted into that device during a subsequent playback operation or inserted, along with its associated disc, in another playback device for controlling another reproduction unit." (Col. 6, lines 45-58)

Further:

> "The user may delete any of the programmed images by pressing the clear button 232, so that any new images may be customized by advancing to the desired image, optionally altering the appearance of the displayed image, and then pressing the store button 230. This new control data is again temporarily stored in scratchpad RAM 45 and then written to removable EEPROM module 60 when the disc is ejected, as described above. (Col. 8, line 55 – Col. 9, line 4)

Figure 3 illustrates the organization of the data stored in EEPROM module 60 for the storage of parameters which control image customization as described above. For purposes of providing an illustrative example, the memory organization of Figure 3 assumes that EEPROM module 60 is a 64K Byte memory, which corresponds to a 16-bit address space. The 64K memory is divided into four separate sections, a pointer table section 120, a video display control data section 140, an optional reprint request data section 160, and an optional album disc data section 180. The lowest

addresses are used to store a pointer table 120 which stores a multiplicity of pointer entries of three different types: disc identification (ID) pointer entries, such as disc #1 pointer entry 102 and disc #n pointer entry 106, print request pointer entries, such as print request pointer entry 110, and album disc request pointer entries, such as album disc request pointer 114.

In this case, even data that has been input by the user requires **both** removable memory media to be available to the user.

In either of the above cases, the stored data contained in the removable memory module is related to the display of the specific images that are stored in separate image files, for the purpose of displaying those images in the manner desired by the user; it is not related to the configuration of a microprocessor or computer for purposes unrelated to the display of those images which previously have been referenced.

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to combine the cited references to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. There must be something *in the prior art* that suggests the proposed combination, other than the hindsight gained from knowledge that the inventor choose to combine these particular things in this particular way. Uniroyal Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner is also required to make specific findings on a suggestion to combine prior-art references. In Re Dembeczak, 175 F.3d 994, 1000-01, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617-19 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The Examiner must also determine what is "analogous prior art" for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue. "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an Applicants' invention, the reference must either be in the field of Applicants' endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also In re Deminski, 796 F.2d 436, 230 USPQ 313 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 659, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060-61 (Fed. Cir. 1992) ("A reference is reasonably pertinent if, even though it may be in a different field from that of the inventor's endeavor, it is one which, because of the matter with which it deals, logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his problem."); and Wang Laboratories Inc. v. Toshiba Corp., 993 F.2d 858, 26 USPQ2d 1767 (Fed. Cir. 1993).